

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,850	09/13/2006	Wilfried Kalchauer	WAS0794PUSA	1276
22045 BROOKS KUS	7590 07/23/200° SHMAN P.C.	EXAMINER		
1000 TOWN CENTER TWENTY-SECOND FLOOR SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075			ZUCKER, PAUL A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1621	
		•		,
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		·	07/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/598,850	KALCHAUER ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
·		Paul A. Zucker	1621				
	G DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address				
Period for Reply							
WHICHEVER IS LC - Extensions of time may be after SIX (6) MONTHS from the NO period for reply is second for reply is second for reply within the Any reply received by the	ONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 cm the mailing date of this communication.	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 36(a). In no event, however, may a re will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•						
1) Responsive to	o communication(s) filed on	_· _·					
·—	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
closed in acco	ordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims	•	•					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u><i>5-11</i></u>	is/are pending in the application						
4a) Of the abo	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5-11</u>	is/are rejected.						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s)	are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	¢				
Application Papers							
9) The specificat	ion is objected to by the Examine	eΓ.					
10) The drawing (s	s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) objected to b	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may	not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
			s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or de	eclaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119						
	ent is made of a claim for foreign come * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).				
	d copies of the priority document						
	d copies of the priority document						
	of the certified copies of the prio	•	received in this National Stage				
	tion from the International Burea ed detailed Office action for a list		received				
	ou detailed effice delibrition differ	·	00011001				
Attachment(s)		∧ □	. (DTO 442)				
 Notice of References (2) Notice of Draftsperson 	Cited (PTO-892) 's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Int	formal Patent Application -				

Application/Control Number: 10/598,850

Art Unit: 1621

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 7, 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The formula R_aH_bSiCl_{4-a-b} recited in claims 7 and 8 describes compounds other than organochlorosilanes when a + b = 4. It is therefore unclear whether the nonchlorinated compounds are encompassed or not by Applicants' claims. Claims 7, 8 and their dependents are therefore rendered indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- 2. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Wakamatsu (JP 20005-029428 03-2005, Machine translation). Wakamatsu discloses (Translation, paragraphs [0058]-[0061]) a process for the purification of silicon tetrachloride (STC, b.p. ~58°C) from its solution containing 0.1 % AlCl₃. by distillation to remove AlCl₃ as a solid. Since STC boils at ~58°C, the Examiner considers that



Application/Control Number: 10/598,850

Art Unit: 1621

the upper temperature limitation is met. STC meets the limitation of the formula R_aH_bSiCl_{4-a-b} when a,b=0. Wakamatsu discloses (Translation, paragraph [0002]) the origin of his material from direct synthesis. Wakamatsu therefore anticipates claims 5-8. **NOTE**: Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- Claims 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
 Wakamatsu (JP 20005-029428 03-2005, Machine translation) in view of Geisberger (US 5,434,286 06-1995).

£

Application/Control Number: 10/598,850

Art Unit: 1621

Instantly claimed is a method for the distillative separation of organochlorosilanes of formula $R_aH_bSiCl_{4-a-b}$ from process $AlCl_3$ contained therein employing a thin film evaporator.

Wakamatsu teaches (Translation, paragraphs [0058]-[0061]) a process for the purification of silicon tetrachloride (STC, b.p. ~58°C) from its solution containing 0.1 % AICI₃ by distillation to remove AICI₃ as a solid. Since STC boils at ~58°C, the Examiner considers that the upper temperature limitation is met. STC meets the limitation of the formula R_aH_bSiCI_{4-a-b} when a,b=0. Wakamatsu teaches (Translation, paragraph [0002]) the origin of his material from direct synthesis.

The difference between the process taught by Wakamatsu and that instantly claimed is that Wakamatsu teaches distillation, as required by the instant claims, but does not specify the use of a thin-film evaporator.

Geisberger, however, teaches (Column 6, lines 52-59 the use of a thin film evaporator for the recovery of alkylchlorosilanes from dissolved materials which, in the present case, corresponds to AlCl₃.

Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the thin film evaporator for the separation of alkylchlorosilanes in the process of Wakamatsu by the suggestion of Geisberger of the suitability of such use. For the same reason there would have been a reasonable expectation for success.

Application/Control Number: 10/598,850 Page 5

Art Unit: 1621

Thus the instantly claimed process would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion

4. Claims 5-11 are pending. Claims 5-11 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul A. Zucker whose telephone number is 571-272-0650. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 5:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Evonne Eyler can be reached on 571-272-0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PAULA. ZUCKER, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER